

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/812,916	03/31/2004	Masakazu Takahashi	251165US0	5710	
22850 7590 06/28/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			ROBINSON, KEITH O NEAL		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1638			
		·	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/28/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/812,916	TAKAHASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
ĺ	Keith O. Robinson, Ph.D.	1638	

	Keith O. Robinson, Ph.D.	1638	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence ac	idress
THE REPLY FILED 24 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION I	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Noving replies: (1) an amendn tice of Appeal (with appeal	otice of Appeal. To avoid al nent, affidavit, or other evid fee) in compliance with 37	ence, which CFR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date ater than SIX MONTHS from the	e mailing date of the final rejec	ction.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		HEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS	FILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office laternay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 tension and the corresponding shortened statutory period for rethan three months after the m	amount of the fee. The appro-	priate extension fee office action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.3	7(e)), to avoid dismissal of	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing	a brief, will not be entered	because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	•	see NOTE below);	
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 	•	rially reducing or simplifyin	g the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		Non-Compliant Amendmer	it (PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		parate, timely filed amendr	nent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro			ı explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will bé) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 14-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>8-13</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections und	er appeal and/or appellant	fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control			
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for allow	ance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendments and arguments, filed May 24, 2007, do not overcome the rejections as set forth in the previous Office Action mailed January 24, 2007. With regards to the 35 112, first paragraph written description rejection, Applicant argues that "a soybean is a soybean" (see page 7, last paragraph of 'Remarks' filed May 24, 2007); however, Applicant only shows possession of soybean lines QF2F3-1, QF2F3-2 and QF2F3-3 having the claimed traits. See MPEP 2163(I) where it states "[t]o satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc., 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116". Also see MPEP 2163.02 where it states, "[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, "does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed." In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989)". Applicant has not invented each and every soybean plant with the claimed characteristics, but only soybean lines QF2F3-1, QF2F3-2 and QF2F3-3 having the claimed traits. With regards to the 35 112, first paragraph, scope of enablement rejection, Applicant argues that a person skill in the art could have made the claimed soybeans other than soybean lines QF2F3-1, QF2F3-2 and QF2F3-3 (see page 12 of 'Remarks' filed May 24, 2007). This is not persuasive. Given the fact that one of skill in the art cannot reasonably predict the number of segregating genes produced from a cross, it is unclear how one of skill in the art could reasonably predict how to make and use the claimed invention.

DAVID H. KRUSE, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER